Testimony of the Michigan Campaign Finance Network on HJR GG House Elections and Ethics Committee, June 4, 2014

Chairwoman Lyons and Members of the Committee:

I testify in opposition to House Joint Resolution GG for one reason: Unless, and until, the drawing of representative districts is removed from the control of overtly partisan actors, election of members of the State Board of Education by district is likely to result in representation that does not reflect the collective will of voters of this state.

I illustrate this concern by including with my testimony a chart of *effective vote* for the last eight election cycles in Michigan. The effective vote metric represents the percentage of the representative delegation won by each party divided by the percentage of the vote won by each party. In a pure democracy the effective vote for both parties would be 1.00. That is, the percentage of the representative delegation and the percentage of the vote should be the same, for each party.

The table clearly shows that deviation from an effective vote of 1.00 for both parties is greater for larger representative districts. That is, deviation is smallest for the Michigan House and greatest for the Michigan delegation to the U.S. House. That is because there are more opportunities to make choices in drawing district lines that yield partisan advantage in larger districts.

The greatest deviation from representation reflecting votes occurred in the 2012 vote for delegates to the U.S. House of Representatives, when Republican votes literally yielded twice as much representation as Democratic votes: an effective vote of 1.41 for Republicans, and an effective vote of 0.70 for Democrats. That was a stunningly effective partisan gerrymander.

It goes without saying that representative districts for the Michigan Board of Education would be larger than Michigan's U.S. House districts, because there would be fewer of them. Therefore, opportunity for perversion of the voters' collective will would be greater than it was in the 2012 U.S. House vote.

I urge you to set this resolution aside. Your energies would be better spent by passing a resolution to place the function of drawing representative district lines in the hands of a commission that is disinterested from partisan political outcomes.

Sincerely yours

Richard L. Robinson Executive Director

Effective Vote How Votes Translate to Representation

| MI House | 1998 | 2000 | 2002 | 2004 | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 |
|--|-----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|
| Republican votes | 1,473,800 | 1,919,869 | 1,520,395 | ,520,395 2,201,727 1,624,975 | 1,624,975 | 1,962,242 | 1,645,620 | ,645,620 2,040,126 |
| vote % | 49.8% | 48.2% | 50.2% | 48.2% | 44.7% | 42.2% | 53.0% | 45.6% |
| Republican Representatives | 58 | 58 | 63 | | 52 | 43 | 63 | 59 |
| % of body | 52.7% | 52.7% | 57.3% | 52.7% | 47.3% | 39.1% | 57.3% | 53.6% |
| effective vote: % body / % vote | 1.06 | 1.09 | 1.14 | 1.09 | 1.06 | 0.93 | 1.08 | 1.16 |
| The state of the s | | | | | | | | |
| Democratic votes | 1,455,442 | 455,442 2,016,994 | 1,498,865 | ,498,865 2,332,501 | 1,979,748 2,682,484 | 2,682,484 | 1,413,587 | 2,387,756 |
| vote % | 49.2% | %9.05 | 49.3% | 51.0% | 54.5% | 57.8% | 45.5% | 53.4% |
| Democratic Representatives | 52 | 52 | 47 | 52 | 58 | 29 | 47 | 51 |
| % of body | 47.3% | 47.3% | 42.7% | 47.3% | 52.7% | %6.09 | 42.7% | 46.4% |
| effective vote: % body / % vote | 96.0 | 0.93 | 0.87 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 1.05 | 0.94 | 0.87 |

| MI Senate | 1998 | 2002 | 2006 | 2010 |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Republican votes | 1,556,762 | 1,532,170 | 1,647,059 | 1,688,851 |
| vote % | 52.3% | 50.1% | 45.0% | 53.8% |
| Republican Senators | 24 | 22 | 21 | 26 |
| % of body | 63.2% | 94.6% | 55.3% | 68.4% |
| effective vote: % body / % vote | 1.21 | 1.16 | 1.23 | 1.27 |
| Democratic votes | 1,388,711 | 1,506,920 | 1,968,080 | 1,404,868 |
| vote % | 46.7% | 49.2% | 53.8% | 44.7% |
| Democratic Senators | 4 | 16 | 17 | 12 |
| % of body | 36.8% | 42.1% | 44.7% | 31.6% |
| effective vote: % body / % vote | 0.79 | 0.86 | 0.81 | 0.71 |

| U.S. House - MI | 1998 | 2000 | 2002 | 2004 | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------|---|---------------------|
| Republican votes | 1,438,283 | | 1,465,178 | ,786,991 1,465,178 2,284,181 | | 1,624,865 2,114,293 | 1,671,707 | 1,671,707 2,238,540 |
| vote % | 48.2% | 43.9% | 48.0% | 49.3% | 44.5% | 45.7% | 52.3% | 45.6% |
| Republican Representatives | 9 | 7 | တ | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 0 |
| % of delegation | 37.5% | 43.8% | %0.09 | %0.09 | %0.09 | 46.7% | %0.09 | 64.3% |
| effective vote: % deleg / % vote | 0.78 | 1.00 | 1.25 | 1.22 | 1.35 | 1.02 | 1.15 | 1.41 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Democratic votes | 1,469,111 | 2,117,678 | 1,507,174 | 2,221,524 | 1,923,485 | 2,516,640 | 1,469,111 2,117,678 1,507,174 2,221,524 1,923,485 2,516,640 1,415,212 | 2,487,243 |
| vote % | 49.2% | 52.0% | 49.3% | 48.0% | 52.7% | 54.3% | 44.3% | 20.7% |
| Democratic Representatives | 10 | თ | 9 | 9 | 9 | ∞ | 9 | 5 |
| % of delegation | 62.5% | 56.3% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 40.0% | 53.3% | 40.0% | 35.7% |
| effective vote: % deleg / % vote | 1.27 | 1.08 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 0.76 | 0.98 | 06.0 | 0.70 |

Michigan Campaign Finance Network